

REMARKS

The indication that claims 8, 11 and 16 are allowable in independent form has been noted with appreciation. For the reasons which follow, it is respectfully submitted that all claims in this case are presently allowable.

Claims 1-7, 9, 10, 12-15 and 17-20 were rejected under 35 USC § 103 over Gavin in view of Bentem. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The present invention relates to a method of producing window glass with defogging heat wires in which a conductive paste is applied in a predetermined pattern and baked. The conductive paste contains silver powder, a molybdenum compound, a glass frit and an organic vehicle. It is respectfully submitted that the claimed method is not taught or suggested in the art applied in the Office Action.

Gavin likewise relates to a method of producing window glass with defogging heat wires in which a conductive paste is applied in a predetermined pattern and baked. The conductive paste contains silver powder, a glass frit and an organic vehicle but there is no molybdenum compound in the silver paste. As pointed out in column 1, the silver tracks had been applied on an enamel which is used to protect the adhesive which glues the window to the motor vehicle body. Gavin adds elemental boron to the silver paste composition in order to better hid the silver tracks when viewed from outside the vehicle. The enamel composition is a combination of glass frit and a colorant (column 4, lines 58-59) which can contain a small amount of a reducing agent (column 5, lines 10-11) which can be, *inter alia*, molybdenum disilicide (column 5, lines 42-46). However, it is the enamel and not the silver paste which contains the molybdenum material. Gavin does not teach or suggest providing a paste containing both silver and molybdenum for any reason.

Galvin teaches a silver paste and an enamel composition. The silver paste does not contain molybdenum and the enamel composition does not contain silver. Galvin does not teach or suggest combining the two compositions.

The Bentem reference has been cited only to show the particle size of silver particles. Accordingly, it cannot cure the basic deficiency in Galvin and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-7, 9, 10, 12-15 and 17-20 were also rejected under 35 USC 103 over Kano in view of Galvin. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Kano reference does, as the Examiner has noted, disclose the making of an auto glass defogger but fails to teach or suggest the use of any molybdenum material in the silver paste applied to the window glass. As discussed above, Galvin has the same deficiency. The combination therefore cannot suggest the claimed invention.

In light of all of the foregoing considerations, it is respectfully submitted that this application is now in condition to be allowed and the early issuance of a Notice of Allowance is respectfully solicited.

Dated: December 13, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By Edward A. Meilman  
Edward A. Meilman

Registration No.: 24,735  
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN &  
OSHINSKY LLP  
1177 Avenue of the Americas  
41st Floor  
New York, New York 10036-2714  
(212) 835-1400  
Attorney for Applicant